UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,868	02/10/2004	David Lawrence	17209-311CP1	1175

54205   7590   06/24/2009
CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
VIZVARY, GERALD C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3696	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/775,868	LAWRENCE, DAVID
	Examiner	Art Unit
	GERALD C. VIZVARY	3696

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _15 April 2009_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-17_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-17_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

4/15/2009 has been entered.

2.   Claims 1 & 7 have been amended. Currently claims 1-17 are presented for

examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The terms "facilitating

monitoring", "indications of insider trading", "related to", "determine whether one or more

financial transactions would violate the rules", "indicative of", "associated with" &

"indications of violations" in claim 1 are unclear and render the claim indefinite. The

terms "facilitating", "indication", "related", "whether one or more financial transactions

would violate", "indicative", "associated" & "indications" are not defined by the claim, and

the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of

ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or

if at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for

omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See

MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the steps for "applying insider trading rules".

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The term "supporting

documentation" in claim 2 is unclear and renders the claim indefinite. The terms

"supporting" is not defined by the claim, and the specification does not provide a

standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be

reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or if at the time the application was

filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The terms "normal range",

"elevated amount of risk" & "responsive to" in claim 3 are unclear and render the claim

indefinite. The terms "facilitating", "indication", "related", "whether one or more financial

transactions would violate", "indicative" & "associated" are not defined by the claim, and

the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of

ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or

if at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The term "an indication" is unclear and renders the claim indefinite. The term "indication" is not defined by the claim, and the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or if at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The terms "involved in", "potential violation" & "related to" in claim 5 are unclear and render the claim indefinite. The terms "involved", "potential" & "related" are not defined by the claim, and the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or if at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The terms "indicative of" & "suggested action" in claim 7 are unclear and render the claim indefinite. The terms "indicative" & "suggested" are not defined by the claim, and the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or if at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the steps for "analyzing the digital information received".

Claim 8 & 9 are rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The term "suggested action" in claims 8 & 9 is unclear and render the claim indefinite. The terms "suggested" is not defined by the claim, and the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or if at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The terms "associated account" & "pattern of activity that may be indicative" in claim 10 are unclear and render the claim indefinite. The terms "associated", "may be" & "indicative" are not defined by the claim, and the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or if at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The term "pattern of activity that may be indicative" in claim 11 are unclear and render the claim indefinite. The

terms "may be" & "indicative" are not defined by the claim, and the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or if at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph. The term "account associated with" in claim 13 are unclear and render the claim indefinite. The term "associated with" is not defined by the claim, and the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the meaning and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention or if at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 6, 12, and 14-17 are also rejected for their dependency from a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-5, 7-11 & 14-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1.

6.   Claims 1-5, 7-11 & 14-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 further in view

of official notice.

As per claim 1 (Currently Amended) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 discloses a <u>processor-</u>

<u>implemented</u> method of facilitating monitoring of a transaction for one or more

indications of insider trading, the method comprising:

receiving digital information related to one or more financial transactions into a storage

of a computer device ("In the first step 100, SNCE and associated data and information

is retrieved from the primary monitoring computer system. This information is stored on

a blackboard (typically a database system is used for the blackboard). "Goldschmidt

6,983,266 B1 col. 7, lines 58-62);

<u>processing the digital information by</u> applying creating ~~rules which relate the digital~~

~~information to~~ insider trading rules ~~in the computer storage~~ to determine whether the

one or more financial transactions would violate the rules ("A specific application of the

conceptual model of the CMAD$_{cm}$ multi-agent decision support system of FIG. 1 will now

be described for supporting the ASX surveillance CMAD$_{cm}$ analyst team review process.

For the sake of brevity, this CMAD$_{cm}$ multi-agent decision support system will be

referred to as ALCOD. ALCOD assists the ASX's surveillance analysts' decision making

task of classifying a SNCE generated by the primary monitoring system (SOMA)."

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 20-28); and

providing a report including the generated risk quotient <u>and the indications of violations.</u>

("Where there appears to have been a breach of the law, the matter is reported to the federal government body that administers the corporations law, namely the Australian Securities Commission (ASC) for further investigation and, if necessary, for legal action." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 47-51)

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 fails to explicitly teach generating a risk quotient indicative of a quantitative amount of insider trading risk (ITR) associated with the financial transaction;

generating an indication that execution of the financial transaction is in violation of one or more of the insider trading rules ("A user interface allows a user to input data relating to the identification and quantification of a company's compliance process and to receive identification and quantification of compliance output. A computer-based compliance identification and quantification tool, as described below in more detail, is stored in server computer 12 and can be accessed by a requester at any one of computers 14." Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 ¶ [0048])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a quantitative measure of security trade risk for an individual trade as taught by Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 in the system of Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 2 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 1.

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further discloses that the digital information received comprises supporting documentation for the transactions. ("FIG. 2 illustrates in flow chart form a preferred embodiment of the method of supporting a compliance agent in CMAD in accordance with the present invention. In the first step 100, SNCE and associated data and information are retrieved from the primary monitoring computer system." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 7, lines 57-61)

As per claim 3 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 1.

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further discloses that the indication of an amount of risk comprises a normal range of risk and an elevated amount of risk and the method additionally comprising the steps of:

generating an action responsive to the particular legal violation. ("Where there appears to have been a breach of the law, the matter is reported to the federal government body that administers the corporations law, namely the Australian Securities Commission (ASC) for further investigation and, if necessary, for legal action." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 47-51)

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 fails to explicitly teach determining a particular legal violation associated with an elevated level of risk.

Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches "The ability to detect (detection) uses a similar numerical scheme with a value of one meaning that if there is noncompliance, the potential failure will be found or prevented to a value of ten representing absolute certainty that current controls will not detect potential failures or there are no controls in place. The severity rating, occurrence and detection factors are then entered into the FMEA matrix 230 under a severity column 246, an occurrence column 248, and a detection factor column 250 respectively." Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 ¶ [0084])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a response based on a severity risk rating as taught by Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 in the system of Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 4 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 1. Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further discloses that the method additionally comprises the step of transmitting an indication to block execution of the one or more financial transactions. ("Once an unusual pattern is detected, if no adequate explanation is found and there appears to have been a breach of the ASX rules, it is reported to the Exchange's companies division (if a listed company is involved), the ASX membership division (if a broker is involved), or the ASX derivatives

division (if a derivative security is involved)." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 38-46)

As per claim 5 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 1. Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further discloses that the method additionally comprises the step of notifying a legal authority involved in enforcing insider trading laws of a potential violation of a law related to the execution of the financial transaction. ("Where there appears to have been a breach of the law, the matter is reported to the federal government body that administers the corporations law, namely the Australian Securities Commission (ASC) for further investigation and, if necessary, for legal action." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 47-51)

As per claim 6 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches method of claim 1.

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 fails to explicitly teach that the digital information is received from at least one of: (i) a bank, (ii) a broker dealer, and (iii) a national trading.

Examiner takes official notice that banks, brokerages and national trades are old and well known sources for securities trading.

As per claim 7 (Currently Amended) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 1.

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further discloses the steps of: analyzing the digital

information received into storage ~~stored data~~ for patterns of behavior indicative of

insider trading ("Unusual patterns might be reflected in heavy turnover in a particular

stock, or in a price change much larger than changes in other stock prices observed

that day." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 38-41); and

automatically generating a suggested action based upon the data. ("Once an unusual

pattern is detected, if no adequate explanation is found and there appears to have been

a breach of the ASX rules, it is reported to the Exchange's companies division (if a listed

company is involved), the ASX membership division (if a broker is involved), or the ASX

derivatives division (if a derivative security is involved)." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col.

12, lines 41-46)

As per claim 8 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093

A1 teaches a method of claim 7. Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further discloses that the

suggested action comprises conveying an insider trading report to a government entity.

("Where there appears to have been a breach of the law, the matter is reported to the

federal government body that administers the corporations law, namely the Australian

Securities Commission (ASC) for further investigation and, if necessary, for legal

action." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 47-51)

As per claim 9 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 7. Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 fails to explicitly teach that the suggested action comprises initiating a risk management clearinghouse search.

Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches "The method can be practiced using a network-based system including a server system coupled to a centralized database and at least one client system." Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 ¶ [0007])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a centralized clearinghouse search as taught by Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 in the system of Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 10 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 7. Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further discloses that the suggested action comprises monitoring an associated account for a pattern of activity that may be indicative of a violation of an insider trading law. ("Unusual patterns might be reflected in heavy turnover in a particular stock, or in a price change much larger than changes in other stock prices observed that day. Once an unusual pattern is detected, if no adequate explanation is found and there appears to have been a breach of the ASX rules, it is reported to the Exchange's companies division (if a listed company is involved), the ASX membership division (if a broker is

involved), or the ASX derivatives division (if a derivative security is involved)."

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 38-46)

As per claim 11 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US

2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 7. Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further

discloses that the suggested action comprises monitoring actions taken by an entity

associated with the financial transaction for a pattern of activity that may be indicative of

a violation of an insider trading law. ("Unusual patterns might be reflected in heavy

turnover in a particular stock, or in a price change much larger than changes in other

stock prices observed that day. Once an unusual pattern is detected, if no adequate

explanation is found and there appears to have been a breach of the ASX rules, it is

reported to the Exchange's companies division (if a listed company is involved), the

ASX membership division (if a broker is involved), or the ASX derivatives division (if a

derivative security is involved)." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 38-46)

As per claim 14 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US

2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 7. Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further

discloses that the suggested action comprises generating an insider trading report

comprising details of the financial transaction and transmitting the report to a trading

exchange associated with the financial transaction. ("Unusual patterns might be

reflected in heavy turnover in a particular stock, or in a price change much larger than

changes in other stock prices observed that day. Once an unusual pattern is detected, if

no adequate explanation is found and there appears to have been a breach of the ASX rules, it is reported to the Exchange's companies division (if a listed company is involved), the ASX membership division (if a broker is involved), or the ASX derivatives division (if a derivative security is involved)." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 12, lines 38-46)

As per claim 15 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 14. Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further discloses that the insider trading report is transmitted via electronic mail. ("It combines computer-based decision support systems to analyse market events with communication software, text retrieval and graphics." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 2, lines 9-11)

As per claim 16 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 14. Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 further discloses that the steps of:

storing a record of the date and time of the transmission; and

storing a record of a destination of the transmission. ("The alert record contains details of the alert type, the SNCE transaction, details of the entity under review (the stock)-- current and historical, and other related information. Control rules on the blackboard retrieve this hypothesis from the output of SOMA." Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 col. 17, lines 49-54)

As per claim 17 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches method of claim 1.

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches fails to explicitly teach that the step of securing the data comprising the insider trading report with at least one of':

(i) encrypting the data,

(ii) password protecting the data,

(iii) protecting the data with a biometric access procedure, and

(iv) refusing to disclose the data except where such disclosure is requested by an appropriate law enforcement or bank supervisory agency.

Examiner takes official notice that encryption, password protection, and biometric protection of secure data as well as an override capability for law enforcement agencies, administrators, and tech support personnel are old and well known in the art.

7.   Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 further in view of Mastwyk US 2002/0091622 A1.

As per claim 12 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 7.

Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 fails to explicitly teach that the suggested action comprises refusing to perform a requested transaction.

Mastwyk US 2002/0091622 A1 teaches "the dynamic information flows which stream through the organisation over time. The design is based on plug gable rules for several core banking information flows, such as; The Credit Process, I.P.O's, Structured Finance Workflow etc. Once the start of such a flow is registered the next steps in the process, including the insiders involved, are immediately closed for trading." (Mastwyk US 2002/0091622 A1 ¶ [0007])

As per claim 13 (Original) Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 teaches a method of claim 7.

 Goldschmidt 6,983,266 B1 in view of Barton US 2002/0059093 A1 fails to explicitly teach that the suggested action comprises closing an account associated with the financial transaction.

Mastwyk US 2002/0091622 A1 teaches "the dynamic information flows which stream through the organisation over time. The design is based on plug gable rules for several core banking information flows, such as; The Credit Process, I.P.O's, Structured Finance Workflow etc. Once the start of such a flow is registered the next steps in the process, including the insiders involved, are immediately closed for trading." Mastwyk US 2002/0091622 A1 ¶ [0007])

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered, but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9.   The following is prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Starnes (US 2002/0194014 A1) teaches a business activity risk management computer

program to identify potential liabilities, evaluate current procedures in dealing with risks

and validate effectiveness of implemented recommended procedures.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gerald C. Vizvary whose telephone number is 571-270-

3268. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ella Colbert can be reached on 571-272-6741. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-4268.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ella Colbert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

Gerald Vizvary
Patent Examiner, A.U. 3696
June 21, 2009